

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter in this application.

Claim 1 has been amended.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foster (US RE 39,059; hereinafter "Foster") in view of Taira et al. (US 2003/0113096; hereinafter "Taira"). For at least the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, neither Foster nor Taira, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders obvious that when said setting portion and one of said direct-execution instructing portions are pressed simultaneously, a target menu being displayed at the time of the pressing operation is set as the direct execution menu and the direct execution menu is assigned to said pressed direct-execution instructing portion. Foster does not disclose the above fact, as admitted by the Examiner. The Office Action states that Foster discloses the electronic device of claim 1 except for pressing the setting portion and the specific direct-execution instructing portion simultaneously and Taira teaches pressing two keys on a remote control to perform a function and thus at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to use the setting portion and the direct-execution instructing portion simultaneously to produce a desired function as taught by Taira. However, Taira only discloses that when two keys are pressed simultaneously, a specific menu can be called by a single action. Taira does not disclose that when these two keys are pressed simultaneously, a target menu being displayed at the time of the pressing operation is set as the direct execution menu and the direct execution menu is assigned to the pressed direct-execution instructing portion. Accordingly, the combination of Foster and Taira does not meet all of the limitations of claim 1, since the combined electronic device would not have a target

menu set as the direct execution menu and the direct execution menu assigned to the direct-execution instructing portion which is pressed simultaneously with the setting portion. Therefore, since every limitation of claim 1 is not taught by the reference, claim 1 would not be obvious over Foster in view of Taira. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5 and 9-11 which are dependent from claim 1 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Claims 2 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foster in view of Taira in further view of De Vito et al. (US Patent 6,452,616, hereinafter "De Vito"). For at least the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 7-8 are dependent from claim 1. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 1 are included in claims 2 and 7-8.

Regarding claim 2 which is dependent from claim 1, none of Foster, Taira and De Vito, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders obvious that when said setting portion and one of said direct-execution instructing portions are pressed simultaneously, a target menu being displayed at the time of the pressing operation is set as the direct execution menu and the direct execution menu is assigned to said pressed direct-execution instructing portion. As described above, neither Foster nor Taira discloses the above fact. The Office Action states De Vito teaches a setting change protection portion which regulates a change of a setting of the direct execution menu by a password. However, De Vito only discloses the use of a password for preventing access to some features of a decoder, such as a parental code or child lock. Accordingly, the combination of Foster, Taira and De Vito does not meet all of the limitations of claim 2, since the combined electronic device would not have a target menu set as the direct execution menu and the direct execution menu assigned to the direct-execution instructing

portion which is pressed simultaneously with the setting portion. Therefore, since every limitation of claim 2 is not taught by the reference, claim 2 would not be obvious over Foster in view of Taira in further view of De Vito. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 which are dependent from claim 2 should be allowable for at least the same reason as claim 2.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foster in view of Taira in further view of Creamer et al. (US Patent 6,930,709, hereinafter "Creamer"). For at least the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 is dependent from claim 1. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 1 are included in claims 6.

Regarding claim 6 which is dependent from claim 1, none of Foster, Taira and Creamer, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders obvious that when said setting portion and one of said direct-execution instructing portions are pressed simultaneously, a target menu being displayed at the time of the pressing operation is set as the direct execution menu and the direct execution menu is assigned to said pressed direct-execution instructing portion. As described above, neither Foster nor Taira discloses the above fact. The Office Action states Creamer teaches the electronic device is a closed circuit television. However, Creamer only discloses CCTV as a source for supplying the digital images to the integrated internet camera. Accordingly, the combination of Foster, Taira and Creamer does not meet all of the limitations of claim 6, since the combined electronic device would not have a target menu set as the direct execution menu and the direct execution menu assigned to the direct-execution instructing portion which is pressed simultaneously with the setting portion. Therefore, since every limitation of claim 6 is not taught by the reference, claim 6 would not be obvious over Foster in

view of Taira in further view of Creamer. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 6 is respectfully requested.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-36205 .

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

July 14, 2008